

ORIGINAL

SUPERIOR COURT  
OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
SUPERIOR COURT OF  
CRIMINAL DIVISION

2012 SEP 21 P 3:55

F11-501-CF1-4384  
Crim. No. 501-CF1-4384

The Hon. Thomas Motley

Sentencing: September 26, 2012

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 KEITH LITTLEPAGE )  
 )

**UNITED STATES' MEMORANDUM IN AID OF SENTENCING**

The United States of America, by its attorney, the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, respectfully submits the following memorandum to assist the Court in fashioning an appropriate sentence in this case.

**BACKGROUND**

Following a trial by jury, Defendant Keith Littlepage was found guilty of First-Degree Murder While Armed (Premeditated), Felony Murder, First-Degree Burglary, Second-Degree Burglary, and three counts of Threats to Injure or Kidnap a Person.

The government is requesting that the Court sentence the defendant to life imprisonment without the possibility of release for the first degree premeditated murder while armed count<sup>1</sup>, and to the high end of the District of Columbia Voluntary Sentencing Guidelines for the Burglary and Threats counts.

---

<sup>1</sup>When there is one killing, a defendant may not be convicted of both first degree premeditated murder and first degree felony murder of the same victim. *Jackson v. United States*, 750 A.2d 551 (D.C. App. 2000)

## ARGUMENT

### Defendant Still Poses a Grave Danger to the Community

Defendant's danger to the community has been shown repeatedly, as it was manifest in the callous and barbaric disregard he demonstrated in killing Selina Knight in cold blood, capping a harrowing week for Ms. Knight in which the defendant repeatedly broke into and ransacked her apartment, harassed her family members, publicly humiliated her, and eerily set the stage for her murder by vandalizing the walls of her apartment. It is critical to note that the instant murder case is not an aberration for this defendant. Indeed, the instant case is not the defendant's first *homicide* conviction; he was convicted in 1981, Superior Court Case No. 1980 FEL 4166, of voluntary manslaughter for killing his then-girlfriend. As evidenced by the judgment and commitment order, the defendant was afforded the benefit of sentencing pursuant to the Youth Rehabilitation Act, as well as a lenient sentence, in connection with his killing of his former girlfriend.

Importantly, the defendant did not take advantage of the opportunities afforded to him by the Youth Act sentence, as he was convicted of Unauthorized Use of a Vehicle ("UUV") just five years after he was convicted of manslaughter. In connection with that UUV case alone, the defendant was afforded four separate periods of parole, and on one of those periods he was convicted of Possession with Intent to Distribute Heroin in 1990. For the next 21 years, the defendant was in and out of prison for a variety of offenses, including convictions for Misdemeanor Threats and Attempted Distribution of Heroin. His record on community supervision has been poor; the defendant has had his parole revoked multiple times, and he displayed "volatile and disruptive" behavior when afforded the opportunity to participate in treatment programs while on supervision (Presentence Report at 19). The defendant's actions in this case, combined with his previous conviction for killing a girlfriend

and his poor adjustment on release for over two decades, demonstrate that incarceration for the rest of his life is the appropriate way to address both the severity of the defendant's actions and the risk he poses if he is ever released.

**Defendant Should be Incarcerated to Punish His Actions**

The government submits that the defendant should receive the harshest sentence this jurisdiction offers as punishment for his conduct here. If defendant had curtailed his actions, Selina Knight would still be alive today. Her family would have been spared much grief and suffering; her sister would have been spared the experience of discovering Selina's body on the couch, surrounded by the defendant's hateful graffiti. Selina's family would have been able to help her and support her through her break-up with the defendant (or even a reconciliation, if there would have been one). For these reasons, and because the defendant showed a callous disregard for the sanctity of human life, on an ongoing basis, he should be held strictly accountable for his actions.

Conclusion

This Court should sentence the defendant to life without the possibility of release. This would be a fair and just result, and an appropriate consequence for the defendant's cold and heartless brutality.

Respectfully submitted,

RONALD C. MACHEN JR.  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Feitel

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Erik Kenerson

Assistant U.S. Attorneys  
U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia  
555 Fourth Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
202.252.7072

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was served by fax and first class mail upon the attorney for the defendant, Tony Matthews, Esquire, and Christopher Kemmitt, Esquire, and fax number 202.824.2645 on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2012.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY